

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 26, 2006. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1 and 9 are in independent form. Claims 1-17 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

A Second Information Disclosure Statement is submitted herewith.

Before discussing the rejections of the claims, Applicant wishes to address three other matters preliminarily.

First, Applicant notes that the Examiner has declined to consider the Information Disclosure Statement filed previously in this application, on the erroneous ground that the cited co-pending applications should have been listed on a form PTO-1449. While the Examiner is correct that *in general* cited information must be listed on a form PTO-1449, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 609.06, which makes clear that cited co-pending U.S. patent applications should not be listed on a form PTO-1449:

“Applicants may wish to list U.S. patent application numbers on other than a form PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08A and 08B format to avoid the application numbers of pending applications being published on the patent.” MPEP § 609.06.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that in his next paper, the Examiner confirms that he has considered the two co-pending applications cited in the Information Disclosure Statement.

Also, Applicant notes that the Office Action is silent regarding Applicant's claim to priority benefit of a Japanese application, and notes that such benefit was claimed

in the Application Data Sheet filed with the present application, and that the required certified copy of the priority application was filed in the Patent and Trademark Office on May 28, 2004 (see the PAIR system). Accordingly, it is also requested that the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the certified copy and of Applicant's claim to priority benefit.

Third, it is noted that no form PTO-892 was received with the Office Action, nor does any appear to be present in the Image File Wrapper of this application in PAIR. Applicant there requests that the next Office Action include such form to ensure that all prior art intended to have been cited, is actually of record.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. That claim has been amended as kindly suggested by the Examiner, and withdrawal of that rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6, 9-14 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication 2002/0029090 (Jean-Pierre Bertin et al.), and Claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from that document in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0172223 (Cherng-Ying Ying et al.).

As explained in the specification, it is common to connect an information processing apparatus such as a printer or multi-function unit to an external device such as a digital still camera or a personal computer. Conventionally, there may be provided just one connection terminal, or several terminals each of which is capable of attachment to a respective single type of external apparatus. Both approaches have drawbacks, the first, in that of course only a single external connection can be maintained at once, and the second, in that the non-interchangeability of the terminals can interfere with the user's

convenience. A standard has been proposed for a connection method based on interchangeable terminals, but at present devices complying with this standard have required installation of an expensive circuit to effect the external connections. The present invention is intended to address these problems.<sup>1/</sup>

Independent Claim 1, for example, is directed to an information processing apparatus capable of communication with an external unit connected thereto. The claimed apparatus comprises two control units (a first control unit and a second control unit) that are connectable with the external unit, for controlling communication between the connected external unit and the information processing apparatus. A switching unit can select either the first or the second control unit to be used as a control unit in a given instance for controlling the communication.

*Bertin* relates to a master/slave apparatus for receiving audiovisual programs. In the *Bertin* apparatus are provided an A type connector (12, see especially Fig. 2), a B type connector (11), a switching circuit (13) and a single USB controller (14). In this arrangement, the switching circuit (13) can switch routes from either of the A type and B type connectors to the USB controller (14). That is, the switching circuit (13) can switch from the A type to the USB, and also can switch from the B type to the USB. Nothing has been found in *Bertin*, however, that would teach or suggest having two USB controllers present. Much less is anything in that publication seen to suggest any switching arrangement that would ever select between two USB controllers to select which of them is to be connected with an external apparatus via connectors.

---

<sup>1/</sup> It is of course to be understood that the claim scope is not limited by the details of this or any other particular embodiment that may be referred to.

Accordingly, in *Bertin*, Applicant submits that there is no disclosure regarding the first control unit, the second control unit or the switching unit as those units are recited in Claim 1.

*Ying* relates to a connection device belonging to a computer accessory apparatus and, particularly to a USB sharer of the computer accessory apparatus. However, even if *Ying* is deemed to show all that it is cited for, that would not supply what is missing from *Bertin* as a reference against Claim 1.

For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is allowable over *Bertin* and *Ying*, taken separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Independent Claim 9 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P Diana/  
Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 583134v1